

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/725,405

Applicant(s)

ANGRES ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond J Henley III

Art Unit

1614

All Participants:

(1) Raymond J Henley III.

(2) Isaac Angres.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 December 2004

Time: PM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

13, 21 and 24

Prior art documents discussed:

Laguana Granja et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,856,316)


Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner ~~will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.~~ is above in PART II.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)


(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature - if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner noted that Laguana Granja et al. was discovered in updating the search of the relevant data bases and that this reference would be the subject of an Examiner's "Reasons for Allowance". Mr. Angres authorized amending claims 13, 21 and 24 in order to expedite allowance, i.e., the Examiner indicated that if "preventing" or "prevention" remained in the claims, that concept would require further consideration under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph. The Examiner also indicated that claim 21 should be amended to clearly require that the combination defined therein was one of both an HMG-CoA reductase inhibitor and a compound that inhibits cholesterol synthesis....